

## Geographic Review Panel 3 – American River/Eastside Tribes

**Proposal number:** 2001-L214

**Short Proposal Title:** Mokelumne River Water  
Diversion Feasibility Study

**1. Applicability to CALFED ERP Goals and Implementation Plan and CVPIA priorities, and relevance to ERP and CVPIA priorities for your region.** The proposed scope of work is directly applicable to CALFED goal (1), recovery of at-risk species, and to the general restoration goals of the CVPIA.

**2. Linkages/coordination with previously funded projects or other restoration activities in your region.** None specified. There are, however, obvious links between this and other CALFED, CVPIA and USFWS AFRP-funded restoration and recovery projects on the Mokelumne River. Notably: the CALFED-funded lower Mokelumne River Watershed Stewardship Plan, and the Woodbridge Irrigation District and City of Lodi restoration program, which includes a fish screen element, and the many ongoing river restoration and management plans funded in part by EBMUD. Whether there has been any effort by the project applicant at coordination is unknown.

**3. Feasibility, especially the project's ability to move forward in a timely and successful manner.** Yes, screening these diversions or developing alternatives to screened diversions is technically feasible, and has been identified as a high priority action at this location.

**4. Qualifications of the applicants and others involved in implementing the proposed project.** Yes. Although the primary Tetra Tech study team has essentially no fish screen design experience. Their subsidiary, KCM, appears to have appropriate experience, but design staffs are not identified. Similar concerns were expressed by the TARP.

**5. Local involvement (including environmental compliance).** Local involvement includes support from the San Joaquin County RCD, the Mokelumne River TAC, and relevant landowners.

Environmental compliance is not applicable to this project phase.

**6. Cost.** Reasonable.

**7. Cost sharing.** None.

**8. Additional comments.** Recommend the project be funded in the amount of \$64,500 contingent upon identification of the project staff with fish screen design experience (see below).

---

### Regional Ranking

**Panel Ranking:** Medium

**Provide a brief explanation of your ranking:** The diversion areas have been identified by CDFG as high priority sites recommended for screening by DFG at the SWRCB-Mokelumne River hearings. However, the following activities in the proposed scope of work exceed that necessary for the project:

- Item (1) has essentially nothing to do with the evaluating screen alternatives or the feasibility of screening the diversions (\$6,000). If this survey element is arguably necessary, an inventory completed by CDFG staff is readily available from either CALFED or CDFG.
- Item (4) proposes to develop and calibrate a numerical hydrological model of the Mokelumne River (\$15,000). If truly necessary to evaluate the feasibility of screening these sites, such a numerical model already exists and is available for use (SWRCB-Mokelumne River hearings).